The Finkle Occlusion: Toward a Theory of Denied Sight

by Dr. Aloysius Finkle, Professor Emeritus of Avant-Garde Aesthetics, Finkle School of Fine Arts

---

It has come to my attention — via three separate emails, a strongly worded voicemail, and one unsolicited fax — that my remarks on Ralph Rumpelton's The Keeper of the Brick Wall have generated what my colleagues in the lesser humanities might call "buzz." Specifically, my coinage of The Finkle Occlusion has escaped the confines of a single review and now threatens to become, God help us all, a term. I feel it is my scholarly duty to formalize it before someone less qualified does so first.

I. A Working Definition

The Finkle Occlusion (n.): The deliberate obstruction, obscuring, or replacement of the eyes in a portrait, performed not as a technical shortfall but as an aesthetic refusal — a withholding of the gaze that forces the viewer's attention outward, onto the rest of the composition, and inward, onto their own presumptions about what a portrait owes them.

Note the operative word: refusal. We live in an age saturated with eye contact — every advertisement, every selfie, every algorithmically optimized headshot straining to lock its gaze with yours and demand something of you. The Occluded Portrait says: not today. It is the visual equivalent of a shrug, and I mean that as the highest possible compliment.

II. Historical Precedent (Which I Am Inventing Retroactively)

One could trace lesser ancestors of the Occlusion through art history — the shadowed sockets of certain Rembrandt self-portraits, the sunglasses of pop art, the closed eyes of funerary sculpture. But these were incidental. Rumpelton's contribution is to make the

occlusion structural — a repeatable device, deployable across subjects, that any sufficiently attentive viewer will begin to recognize on sight (an irony I trust is not lost on anyone).

I should note, in the interest of academic transparency, that I was later informed the "occlusion" in question was, in the artist's own words, supposed to be sunglasses. I stand by my analysis regardless. A theory robust enough to survive contact with the artist's actual intentions is, I would argue, a stronger theory, not a weaker one. Intentionality is a bourgeois constraint I outgrew somewhere around my second sabbatical.

1.1.4 III. Why the Occlusion Matters (To Me, Specifically)

Every portrait makes a promise: look here, and you will understand something. The Occluded Portrait breaks that promise on purpose, and in doing so, asks a more interesting question — not "what does this person see," but "what do you see, now that you can't check your work against theirs?" The beard, the wall, the hat brim pulled low: these become the entire interpretive burden. The viewer is left alone with the composition, uncomforted, unmet, and — if the piece is any good — a little unsettled by how much they were relying on eye contact to do their thinking for them.

1.1.5 IV. A Note on Detractors

I anticipate the objection that I am, to put it bluntly, making this up as I go. To which I say: so did every critic who ever named a movement before the movement's own participants had agreed to it. Cubism was a slur before it was a syllabus. The Finkle Occlusion will have its day in the same way — first mocked, then cited, then eventually taught badly by adjuncts who've never read the primary source.

Four out of five palette knives. I remain, as ever, unconvinced by eyes.